

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03231 111930Z

65

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 EUR-12 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01

ISO-00 /089 W

----- 004815

R 111820Z JUN 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASJDC 2254

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USNMR SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T USNATO 3231

E.OM 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: TIME BETWEEN PHASES: SPC MEETING JUNE 9

REFS: A. STATE 110784

B. STATE 133048

C. USNATO 2969 DTG 271800Z MAY 75

SUMMARY: AT JUNE 9 SPC MEETING, UK, CANADA, AND THE NETHERLANDS
STRONGLY SUPPORTED U.S. POSITION ON SHORTENING THE TIME BETWEEN PHASES.

HOWEVER, FRG TOOK FIRM POSITION AGAINST U.S. PROPOSAL, AND BELGIAN
AND ITALIAN REPS INDICATED MISGIVINGS. FRG, AS IN THE PAST, CONTINUES
TO WANT TO LINK IMPLEMENTATION OF SOVIET PHASE I WITHDRAWALS WITH
BEGINNING OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS. SPC RETURNS TO THIS SUBJECT
THURSDAY, JUNE 12.

END SUMMARY

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03231 111930Z

1. U.S. REP (MOORE) REVIEWED THE U.S. PROPOSAL TO SHORTEN THE
TIME BETWEEN PHASES IN LIGHT OF THE DISCUSSION WHICH HAD TAKEN
PLACE THUS FAR IN SPC. HE NOTED THAT U.S. PROPOSAL WAS TIMELY IN
LIGHT OF CURRENT EASTERN ATTACKS ON PHASING, AND WOULD HELP THE

AHG MEET ONE OF THE EAST'S MAIN CRITICISMS OF PHASING, NAMELY THE LONG AND INDETERMINATE TIME BETWEEN PHASES. IF THE EAST STILL REJECTED PHASING AFTER THE ALLIES MADE THIS OFFER, THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE LOST NOTHING, BUT WOULD HAVE GAINED A BETTER POSTURE FOR EVENTUAL EXPLANATION OF ALLIED POSITION TO THE PUBLIC. IF ON THE OTHER HAND THIS PROPOSAL ENHANCED THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF PHASING AND LED THE EAST TO ACCEPT IT, THE ALLIES WOULD HAVE MADE SIGNIFICANT GAIN BY OBTAINING PRECISE SOVIET OBLIGATION TO IMPLEMENT WITHDRAWALS WITHIN A CERTAIN TIME: BY SINGLING OUT THE SOVIETS FOR RELATIVELY LARGE CUTS, AND BY PLACING A CEILING ON SOVIETS WITHOUT INCURRING NATIONAL CEILINGS FOR NON-U.S. ALLIES. IF THE SOVIETS DELAYED PHASE I WITHDRAWALS AFTER INCURRING SUCH A PRECISE COMMITMENT, THE ALLIES SHOULD INCUR NO DOMESTIC, POLITICAL PROBLEMS IN STALLING THE PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS.

2. U.S. REP ALSO DREW ON REF B REGARDING THE DUTCH PROPOSAL THAT PHASE I WITHDRAWALS SHOULD BE COMPLETED NO LATER THAN 24 MONTHS AFTER SIGNATURE.

3. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) REITERATED DUTCH SUPPORT FOR THE MAIN ELEMENTS OF THE U.S. PROPOSALS. HE NOTED THAT AUTHORITIES CONSIDERED IT MOST UNLIKELY THAT THE ALLIES WOULD INITIAL A PHASE II AGREEMENT PRIOR TO FULL IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I WITHDRAWALS. HE SAID HIS AUTHORITIES RECOGNIZED THAT THEIR AMENDMENT OF THE U.S. PROPOSAL HAD NO SUPPORT (COMMENT: HE DID NOT, HOWEVER, WITHDRAW THE DUTCH AMENDMENT).

4. UK REP (BAILES) SAID SHE HAD NOW RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS TO SUPPORT THE U.S. PROPOSAL IN ALL ITS ELEMENTS. IT WOULD IMPROVE THE ALLIED POSITION VIS-A-VIS THE EAST, WITHOUT LOSING THE ALLIES ANYTHING. IF IT DID NOT LEAD THE EAST TO ACCEPT PHASING, THE ALLIES WOULD AT LEAST HAVE A GOOD PUBLIC POSTURE.

5. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) NOTED THAT CANADA HAS ACCEPTED THE U.S. PROPOSAL IN FULL.

SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03231 111930Z

6. FRG REP (HOYNCK) REITERATED FR VIEW THAT THE U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD NOT ENHANCE THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF PHASING TO THE OTHER SIDE, SINCE OTHER ELEMENTS OF PHASING HAVE ALWAYS BEEN MORE IMPORTANT TO THE EAST THAN THE TIME BETWEEN PHASES. THE U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD IN FACT NOT SIGNIFICANTLY SHORTEN THE PERIOD BETWEEN PHASES. THE U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD CONVEY TO THE EAST THE NOTION THAT THE ALLIES COULD PREPARE THEIR PHASE II POSITION WITHIN A FEW MONTHS, WHICH THE FRG CONSIDERED DOUBTFUL. U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD APPEAR TO THE EAST AS A DEPARTURE FROM THE ALLIED POSITION ON PHASING, SINCE IT WOULD BE CLEAR TO THE EAST THAT THE ALLIES WERE READY TO START PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS PRIOR TO COMPLETION OF IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I WITHDRAWALS. THE U.S. PROPOSAL THUS DEPARTS FROM PARA 13 OF THE ALLIED NEGOTIATING MANDATE (C-M(73)83), WHICH STATED

THAT ONE PURPOSE OF PHASING WAS TO ENSURE THAT MBFR IS IMPLEMENTED IN A CONTROLLED WAY. THIS WOULD ONLY ENCOURAGE THE EAST TO HARDEN STILL FURTHER ITS POSITION ON PHASING. IN ANY EVENT, IT WOULD NOT BE FEASIBLE POLITICALLY FOR ALLIES TO STALL PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS IN ORDER TO ENSURE SOVIET IMPLEMENTATION OF PHASE I REDUCTIONS. FRG CONSIDERS IT ESSENTIAL TO SEE THAT SOVIETS HAVE IMPLEMENTED WITHDRAWALS PRIOR TO BEGINNING THE SECOND PHASE OF NEGOTIATIONS. FRG WOULD NOT WANT TO PUT FORWARD THE U.S. PROPOSAL SIMPLY TO TRY TO IMPROVE ALLIED PUBLIC POSTURE.

7. U.S. REP POINTED OUT THAT U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY SHORTEN THE PERIOD BETWEEN PHASES, AND EXPLAINED WHY PRESENT NAC GUIDANCE MAKES TIME BETWEEN PHASES APPEAR TO BE TWO YEARS OR LONGER. HE POINTED OUT THAT U.S. PROPOSAL DID NOT SAY THAT IT WOULD JUST TAKE A FEW MONTHS TO PREPARE ALLIED POSITIONS FOR PHASE II. PRESUMABLY WHEN SHAPE OF PHASE I AGREEMENT WAS IN SIGHT, ALLIES WOULD ALREADY BE DOING SOME WORK ON PHASE II. U.S. PROPOSAL SAYS IT WOULD TAKE A FEW MONTHS AFTER SIGNATURE OF PHASE I FOR ALLIES TO HAVE PREPARED PHASE II POSITION. HE STRESSED THAT U.S. PROPOSAL DID NOT CONSTITUTE A SUBSTANTIAL MODIFICATION OF PHASING, BUT A STRENGTHENING OF PHASING, SINCE IT WOULD COMMIT THE SOVIETS TO A PRECISE OBLIGATION TO IMPLEMENT WITHDRAWALS WITHIN A CERTAIN PERIOD. THE U.S. PROPOSAL WAS THUS FULLY CONSISTENT WITH PARA 13 OF THE ALLIED NEGOTIATING MANDATE. THIS PRECISE SOVIET COMMITMENT WOULD PUT ALLIES IN A BETTER POSITION WITH THEIR PUBLICS TO STALL PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS IF THE SOVIETS VIOLATED THAT PRECISE COMMITMENT.

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03231 111930Z

8. FRG REP CLAIMED THAT AHG HAD NEVER FULLY USED PRESENT NAC GUIDANCE, SO ALLIED POSITION DO NOT APPEAR TO THE EAST TO CALL FOR A TWO YEAR TIME BETWEEN PHASES. U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD IN EFFECT NOT SHORTEN THE TIME BETWEEN PHASES SIGNIFICANTLY, FRG ATTACHED GREAT IMPORTANCE TO PRESENT NAC GUIDANCE, WHICH ENABLES ALLIES TO RELATE IMPLEMENTATION OF SOVIET PHASE I WITHDRAWALS TO THE BEGINNING OF PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS.

9. UK REP CITED THE MEETING IN WHICH AHG HAD USED THE PRESENT NAC GUIDANCE WITH THE EAST, AND AGREED WITH THE U.S. REP THAT THIS GUIDANCE APPEARED TO THE EAST TO CALL FOR A TWO YEAR TIME BETWEEN PHASES, AND THAT THE U.S. PROPOSAL WOULD SIGNIFICANTLY SHORTEN THIS PERIOD. CANADIAN REP SAID THAT U.S. PROPOSAL WAS NOT A SUBSTANTIVE MODIFICATION OF PHASING, BUT A CLARIFICATION.

10. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) THOUGHT THAT THE PERIOD BETWEEN PHASES WAS ALREADY TOO SMALL, AND SAW NO REASON FOR THE ALLIES TO TAKE AN INITIATIVE AT THIS TIME.

11. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) HAD NOT INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING THE PRESENT U.S. PROPOSAL, BUT RECALLED THE PREVIOUS BELGIAN POSITION THAT PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS SHOULD NOT BEGIN UNTIL THERE IS SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS IN SOVIET PHASE I WITHDRAWALS.

BELGIAN REP HAS TOLD MISSION OFFICER PRIVATELY THAT HE EXPECTS
NO CHANGE IN BELGIAN POSITION ON THIS POINT. HE SEES LITTLE
GAIN IN THE U.S. PROPOSAL, SINCE EASTERN CONCERN ON PHASING
IS CONCENTRATED MUCH MORE ON SPECIFIC REDUCTION COMMITMENTS OF
PHASE II.

12. SPC RETURNS TO TIME BETWEEN PHASES ON THURSDAY, JUNE 12.
BRUCE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 11 JUN 1975
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: CunninFX
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03231
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t19750698/abbrzkmi.tel
Line Count: 173
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. STATE 110784 B. STATE 133048 C. USNATO 2969 DTG 271800Z MAY 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: CunninFX
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 09 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <09 APR 2003 by BoyleJA>; APPROVED <16 SEP 2003 by CunninFX>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: TIME BETWEEN PHASES: SPC MEETING JUNE 9
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE WASJDC
SECDEF INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006